


Yesterday, Plaintiffs filed a letter characterizing their failure to file an opposition by the required date as “excusable” in light of “[t]he tangled record of pending and previously pending motions” and the disruption caused by the global pandemic. *See* ECF No. 38. But Plaintiffs did not need to sift through a tangled record to determine the applicable deadline, as it was announced during a conference held on April 22, 2020 and clearly memorialized in an Order issued that day. *See* ECF No. 21. Nor do Plaintiffs explain how, exactly, the pandemic caused their “inadvertent omission.” ECF No. 38. There is no excuse for Plaintiffs’ failure to comply with the Court’s Order.

That said, in view of the fact that counsel has been actively litigating this case, had indicated his opposition to the motion, and has now filed a formal opposition, *see* ECF No. 37, the Court exercises its discretion not to grant Defendants' motion as unopposed and to extend Plaintiffs' deadline *nunc pro tunc*. Plaintiffs are, however, cautioned that further failures to comply with deadlines may result in sanctions. Defendants Mei Fong Chan and J&J Asian Bistro Inc. shall file any reply in further support of the motion to disqualify counsel no later than **June 19, 2020**.<sup>1</sup>

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 12, 2020  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSE M. FURMAN  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants filed a letter in reply to Plaintiffs' response to the order to show cause, as both a reply in support of the motion to disqualify and a letter regarding the order to show cause. *See* ECF Nos. 39, 40. Because the letter does not address the arguments raised in Plaintiffs' opposition, the Court does not construe it as Defendants' reply brief.